

and 46 have been allowed. Applicant agrees with the allowance of claims 45 and 46, and respectfully submits the Examiner's restriction of claims 45 and 46 is improper. Claims 45 and 46 are further embodiments of the same invention set forth in the Specification.

#### The Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings on the basis that the drawings do not show "the at least one non-magnetic wedge disposed within each of the ferromagnetic pole segments as recited in claim 37." Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 as filed does not include a limitation of "at least one non-magnetic wedge disposed within each of the ferromagnetic pole segments." Instead, Claim 37 as filed on June 3, 2002, and as faxed to the Examiner at his request on November 18, 2002 and then again on January 6, 2002, reads as follows:

37. The multi-pole rotor according to claim 35, wherein the width of said slots varies in a continuous manner in the direction from the inner surface of the rotor to the outer surface of the rotor.

Applicant instead calls the Examiner's attention to claim 46, which includes the limitation referred to in the Office Action. Claim 46, which was allowed, recites "the at least one non-magnetic wedge" shown by non-magnetic pole pieces 24 in Figure 2. (See also Specification at p. 8, lines 1-3.) As shown in Figure 2, the non-magnetic pole pieces 24 are wedge-like in appearance.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection to the drawings is improper.

#### The Claims